



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/004,904	12/03/2001	Robert Charles Rosselot	8798L PRGA 0104 PUS	8508
27752	7590	08/09/2006	EXAMINER	
THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DIVISION WINTON HILL BUSINESS CENTER - BOX 161 6110 CENTER HILL AVENUE CINCINNATI, OH 45224			LUU, SY D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2174	

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/004,904

Applicant(s)

ROSSELOT, ROBERT CHARLES

Examiner

Sy D. Luu

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-57 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 54-57 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-53 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to the Amendments filed May 15, 2006 and June 9, 2005.
2. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, Claims 1-53, filed May 15, 2006 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the Examiner has failed to provided a requisite basis for the Restriction Requirement, and thus a search and examination of the entire application would not place a serious burden on the Examiner. This is not found to be persuasive because, as indicated in the previous communication, Group I is drawn to a method wherein a user has access to and control, via a GUI, data processing systems or components at a location removed from the user, and Group II is drawn completely to a method for allocating and scheduling of resources. Thus, the requirement is still deemed proper.
3. Claims 1-53 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 30, 47 are independent claims. Claims 54-57 were withdrawn. This action is made Non-Final.
4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. Claims 1-11, 15-34, 36-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McNerney et al ("McNerney", US 5,999,208) in view of Humpleman et al. ("Humpleman", US 6,288,716 B1).

As per claim 1, McNerney teaches a method for controlling conference room devices connected to a first computer, the method comprising:

receiving status information from the conference room devices connected to the first computer,

displaying a device menu of available devices for a particular conference room, and

transmitting commands to a selected one of the available devices to control the selected device in response to user input (col. 6, lines 11 et seq.; col. 5, lines 9-13).

While McNerney teaches the steps of displaying a device menu, selecting a device (*e.g. a VCR*) for activating a communication functionality (claims 3-4), McNerney does not expressly disclose the step of displaying a control menu to control at least one of the available devices. However, such a step is known in the art. For instance, Humpleman teaches a method for commanding and controlling a plurality of diverse devices connected to a computer in a network, wherein a control menu is provided to control individual devices (fig 10; col. 7, lines 4-18 and lines 43-47). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine Humpleman's teaching with McNerney's method in order to provide users with complete control of a device's functionality from a remote location.

As per claim 2, McNerney teaches the devices to include at least one of an ambient lighting control, ambient temperature control, a speaker phone, audio equipment, video equipment, window coverings, and a physical access control (col. 2, lines 25-28), as well as Humpleman (fig. 7).

As per claims 3-4, Humpleman teaches the device menu and the control menu are displayed simultaneously, or on a common screen (abstract; fig. 10).

As per claims 5-7, the method of McNerney-Humpleman does not explicitly disclose a type menu for selection of a type of conference, as well as displaying available devices according. However, conferencing having different types and displaying of only available options are well known in the art. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include with the method of McNerney-Humpleman, menu selections for users to choose different types of conferencing depending on the required/desired situation such as audio only or both audio/video. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to display only those devices that are available so that users are only being presented with those devices that are operable under the chosen type conferencing.

As per claims 8-9, Humpleman teaches the steps of sending formatted menus to a second computer via a computer network wherein the second computer is remotely located from the first computer to allow a remote user to control the conference room devices, wherein the displaying steps comprising sending web browser compatible menus to a second computer accessible via the internet (col. 21, lines 1-6).

As per claim 10, Humpleman teaches displaying status information for at least one of the conference room devices connected to the first computer (col. 5, lines 36-39).

As per claim 11, Humpleman teaches the step of automatically determining whether a compatible device has been added to or removed from the conference computer, and automatically updating a status of the compatible device on at least one of the menus (col. 11, lines 48-49).

As per claims 15-16, the method of McNerney-Humpleman does not disclose the steps of sending a video image of the conference room to technical support personnel, and sending a

Art Unit: 2174

videoconferencing output to technical support personnel in addition to the video image of the conference room to aid in troubleshooting any problems with the conference room devices. However, the steps of sending pertinent information such as image or non-image snapshot of a situation requiring attention to technical support personnel is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include these features with the method of McNerney-Humpleman in order to provide the user/technical support personnel with pertinent information for taking appropriate corrective actions.

As per claim 17, Humpleman teaches the step of displaying a control menu to comprise displaying a plurality of buttons including at least buttons corresponding to play, pause, stop, forward, and reverse (fig. 11).

As per claim 18, the method of McNerney-Humpleman teaches the step of displaying a control menu to comprise displaying a plurality of buttons including at least buttons corresponding to pan, tilt, and zoom (McNerney; col. 2, lines 33-38)

As per claims 19-21, Humpleman teaches the steps of transmitting to comprise: wirelessly transmitting commands from the first computer to the (conference) room devices, transmitting commands from the first computer to the (conference) room devices using a two-way protocol, wherein the two-way protocol comprises at least one of RS-232 and telnet (col. 5, lines 50-60).

As per claim 22, Humpleman teaches the steps of displaying to comprise displaying menus for selection by a user via pointing or touching (col. 5, lines 23-27; col. 8, lines 9-18).

Claims 23-27 are similar in scope to claims 15-16, and are rejected under similar rationale.

As per claims 28-29, the method of McNerney-Humpleman teaches the steps of locally previewing output from a selected one of the devices, sending the output to a remote location in response to a send command (figs. 8-11; col. 21, lines 1-6), and displaying a summary screen having status information for all conference room devices associated with a selected conference room (figs. 7-11).

Claims 30-34 and 36-46 are similar in scope to claims 1-2, 8-9, 11, 18-41, 5-7 and 28-29 respectively, and are rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 47 is similar in scope to claims 1, 8, and 18, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale. McNerney further teaches a telephone in communication with the computer for dialing telephone numbers and providing audio communication between the conference room and a remote location (col. 1, lines 35-44; col. 6, lines 15-18). While the method of McNerney-Humpleman does not expressly disclose the use of a touch panel for receiving commands, however, touch panels are notoriously well known in the art. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the use of touch panels with the method of McNerney-Humpleman in order to provide users with another facilitating means for inputting commands.

Claims 48-51 are similar in scope to claims 1, 8 and 10, and are rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 52-53 are similar in scope to claims 15-16, and are rejected under similar rationale.

Art Unit: 2174

6. Claims 12-13 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McNerney et al (“McNerney”, US 5,999,208) and Humpleman et al. (“Humpleman”, US 6,288,716 B1) in view of Venkatraman et al. (“Venkatraman”, US 6,139,177).

As per claims 12-13, the method of McNerney-Humpleman does not disclose the steps of automatically sending a message to technical support in response to a corresponding device status, wherein the step of sending comprises sending an email message. Venkatraman teaches a method for device access and control, wherein email messages are employed to notify specific personnel when predetermined events in a device occur (col. 8, lines 25 et seq.). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine Venkatraman’s teaching with the method of McNerney-Humpleman in order to provide the user/technical support with alerts for taking appropriate actions.

Claim 35 is similar in scope to claim 12, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

7. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McNerney et al (“McNerney”, US 5,999,208) and Humpleman et al. (“Humpleman”, US 6,288,716 B1) in view of Graziano et al. (“Graziano”, US 20020111698 A1).

As per claim 14, the method of McNerney-Humpleman does not disclose the steps of transmitting a numeric or alphanumeric message to a wireless device indicating a need for technical support. Graziano teaches a method for monitoring and controlling a plurality of devices, wherein a numeric or alphanumeric message is transmitted to a wireless device (paragraph 85). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine

Art Unit: 2174

Graziano's teaching with the method of McNerney-Humpleman in order to provide the user/technical support with alerts for taking appropriate actions.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to the independent claims, filed June 9, 2005, have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of McNerney et al. and Humpleman et al. as set forth above.

Inquires

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sy Luu whose telephone number is (571) 272-4064. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:300 am to 4:00 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (571) 272-4063.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



**SY D. LUU
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2174**